Claims such as these may not properly be asserted in a habeas petition, or as part of a habeas petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); see also Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 498-500, 93 S. Ct. 1827, 36 L. Ed. 2d 439 (1973). Rather, such claims must be asserted in a separate civil rights action. The Court does have discretion to construe petitioner's habeas petition as a civil rights complaint. See Wilwording v. Swenson, 404 U.S. 249, 251, 92 S. Ct. 407, 30 L. Ed. 2d 418 (1971); Hansen v. May, 502 F.2d 728, 729 (9th Cir. 1974). However, in this instance, the Court chooses not to exercise such discretion for the following reason: As the current action was not submitted on a civil rights complaint form, certain critical information, such as the capacity in which the defendants are named, is lacking. Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.

IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that this action be summarily dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk is directed to send petitioner a blank Central District civil rights complaint form, which petitioner is encouraged to utilize should she desire to pursue this action.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

DATED: January 29, 2015

NITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

David T. Bristow United States Magistrate Judge